

REMARKS

I. Preliminary Matters

Upon entry of the Amendment, which is respectfully requested, claims 1-5 and 7 will be pending in the application.

Claim 6 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

The Specification is amended to be written in full, clear, concise and exact terms, in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

No new matter is added.

II. Response to Objections to the Specification

Applicants respectfully submit, that in light of the amendments to the Specification, the objection to the specification is overcome.

Applicants respectfully submit that support for claim 3 can be found at least at page 6, lines 16-18.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Specification is therefore respectfully requested.

III. Response to Objection to Claim 6

Applicants respectfully submit that cancellation of claim 6 renders the objection moot.

IV. Response to Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Furukawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,129,097) in view of Liu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,160,532).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants submit that the present invention uses conductive nanoparticles. See at least present claim 1. In contrast, both Furukawa and Lui disclose the use of carbon nanotubes. A "nanotube" has an elongate shape, whereas a "nanoparticle" has a spherical shape. Therefore, the nanotube is quite different from the nanoparticle. For example, it is possible to define the particle diameter of the nanoparticle as recited in claim 2, but it is impossible to do the same for a nanotube.

Furthermore, present claim 1 recites a conductor layer that comprises at least the conductive nanoparticles and the binder resin. Neither Furukawa nor Lui teaches or suggests a binder resin.

Additionally, in the present invention oxidization of an electrode layer is made after forming the conductor layer including the conductive nanoparticles, whereas Lui discloses growing the carbon nanotube after oxidizing a metal substrate layer.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have arrived at the presently claimed invention based on the combination of

Furkawa and Liu. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 1 and 4 based on Furukawa in view of Liu are respectfully requested.

Furthermore, the Examiner indicates that claims 2-3, 5 and 7 are rejected as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the above, claims 2-3, 5 and 7 are patentable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860


WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 1, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Howard L. Bernstein
Registration No. 25,665